

**REMARKS**

Applicant urges reconsideration of the subject U.S. patent application in view of the claims as amended and the following remarks.

**Drawings**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant has amended the drawings to show the claimed features. Applicant has attached a proposed redline mark-up of Fig. 2 indicating the claimed feature as element 28. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification at page 6, line 7.

**Claim Rejections**

**35 U.S.C. §103**

**The Lyman et al. Patent in View of the Brossardt et al. Patent**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable in view of Lyman et al., U.S. Patent 3,559,728, in view of Brossardt et al., U.S. Patent 5,184,879. Applicant respectfully urges reconsideration of the rejection in view of the following remarks.

The Lyman et al. patent teaches a cooling unit which is built on the front side of a cabinet. The cabinet door has only openings for circulating air coming from the inside of the cabinet and leading across the inside of the cooling unit. After passing and

cooling the air from the inside of the cabinet, the cooled air is led back to the inside of the cabinet. Should the cooling components taught by the Lyman et al. patent fail, the entire cooling unit must be removed from the cabinet and replaced or repaired.

The Brossardt et al. patent teaches a cabinet having a spacer frame that accommodates various mounted components, including a cooling unit. Per the teachings of the Brossardt et al. patent (Abstract, line 18-21 and Col. 2, lines 47-58), the cooling unit extends into the interior of the cabinet when installed.

On the contrary, the claimed invention requires that the cooling components be entirely contained and wired within the door. As such, access to the cooling components is separate and apart from the remaining electronic components within the cabinet thereby eliminating any potential interference with such components during the repair process.

Applicant urges that, as amended, the claimed invention is not taught or suggested by the Lyman et al. patent and/or the Brossardt et al. patent. Applicant's claimed invention requires a trapezoidal cabinet door comprising a tub-shaped housing for receiving a plurality of air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) and delimiting a receptacle space adjoining an interior of a rack (10) in which the air-conditioner components (23, 24, 25) are connected and wired with each other *are connected and*

*wired with each other entirely within the receptacle space for retrofitting the cabinet door (30) with the rack (10) separately from the interior of the rack (10).* This configuration enables cabinet doors to be separately constructed, delivered and installed as discussed in the Substitute Specification at page 6, line 18 through page 7, line 3.

In contrast, neither the Lyman et al. patent and the Brossardt et al. patent teach an integrated air conditioning system contained entirely within a separable cover. The Lyman et al. patent teaches a self-contained heat exchange unit having a plurality of vents 31, 22 extending between the unit and the cabinet. The Lyman et al. patent teaches coextensive vents 31, 22 that preclude a separate, retrofittable cover. The Lyman et al. patent also does not teach or suggest pre-wired air-conditioning components as taught by Applicant's claimed invention. The Brossardt et al. patent does not teach or suggest a separable cover for a control cabinet but instead teaches at line 18-21 of the Abstract that the air conditioning device extends into the interior of the control cabinet or flush with the control cabinet with the use of spacing elements.

The interference taught by the cited references between the cabinet internals and the cooling units is directly contrary to one object of the claimed invention requiring covers having cooling units that are separately manufacturable, repairable and retrofittable. The systems taught by the cited references do not permit any of these

COPY

Serial No.: 09/101,498

features. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant urges that Claims 1 and 5 are not taught or suggested by the Lyman et al. patent in view of the Brossardt et al. patent.

In addition, Claim 6 requires that an open end of the cabinet door is coextensive with an open end of the switchgear cabinet. Clearly neither the Lyman et al. patent nor the Brossardt et al. patent teach or suggest an *open end* of a cabinet door coextensive with an *open end* of a switchgear cabinet, resulting in a clamshell like engagement between the retrofittable cabinet door and the switchgear cabinet. Such an open end mating arrangement is in direct contrast to the complex venting and attachment systems taught by the Lyman et al. patent and the Brossardt et al. patent.

#### **Request for Telephone Interview**

Applicant urges that the foregoing amendment and remarks should place the subject U.S. patent application into condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at 847.490.1400 should any issue require further amendment and/or discussion.

Serial No.: 09/101,498

COPY

**Correspondence Address**

Applicant respectfully requests that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office confirm that the proper correspondence address is entered for the subject U.S. patent application. The proper correspondence address, as shown below, is: Pauley Petersen & Erickson, 2800 W. Higgins Road; Suite 365, Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60195.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin D. Erickson  
Reg. No. 38,736

Pauley Petersen & Erickson  
2800 W. Higgins Road  
Suite 365  
Hoffman Estates, IL 60195  
847.490.1400  
fax.847.490.1403